

Rick Buell - Docket Number: 01-SIT-1 (Proposed Siting Rule changes)

From: Michael Murphy <murphysmailbox@juno.com>
To: <rbuell@energy.state.ca.us>
Date: 7/23/01 10:18 AM
Subject: Docket Number: 01-SIT-1 (Proposed Siting Rule changes)
CC: <Pross@energy.state.ca.us>, <Pao@energy.state.ca.us>, <murphysmailbox@juno.com>

7/23/01

Comments regarding "Proposed changes to Siting Regulations".
 Docket Number 01-SIT-1

To: Commissioners of the CEC

I am outraged that you are proposing to dilute public participation in any manner. After participating for 2 years in the Proposed Metcalf Power Plant "approval" process I find the following improvements to your procedures to be essential if you hope for or care about the public's trust in your process.

1. Call the process a "Review Process", not an "Approval Process".
 We in the public sector already have good reason to see your process as a "rubber stamp" of any application for building a power plant. (\$400 million dollar proposed plant vs. the insignificant objections of over 7,000 insignificant NIMBY residents who believe that building a plant one half mile from 2 Schools and one half mile from dense neighborhoods is an abrogation of the public's trust placed in your hands)
2. Increase the participation by the public so that they actually have a say in where and when power plants should be built. Admit public representatives to ALL meetings, (no phone contacts should be allowed) where a proposed plant will be discussed. By being present when CEC staff, ISO staff, and the applicant's representatives are discussing details of the application and details of the mitigations proposed to "cover up" the impacts, the public would be better able to understand and influence the process.
3. Establish increased representation through the Public Advisor's office.
4. Create a pool of Attorney's who will be available as legal counsel to intervenors in each proposed power plant. (similar to pools of "Arbitrators") Since the State is supposed to hear the public's point of view, and since the other parties in the review process already have legal representation (applicant pays for theirs and the State -me and my fellow citizens- already pay for the CEC's) it is reasonable to expect the State to pay for legal counsel of the public's representatives known as "Intervenors". (And no, after 2 years of involvement I emphatically do not feel the CEC represents an unbiased and politically neutral stance. I most certainly do not feel the CEC is watching out for the best interests of the public good.)

Sincerely,

Mike Murphy, Intervenor
408 629-3448
murphysmailbox@juno.com